



5. To return to the Linnean usage of Scheme 1 would cause the utmost confusion, especially as Species A and Species B (red) are apparently mimics. It is in fact doubtful if those zoologists who lack any particular interest in nomenclature would ever get into the habit of using Scheme 1; even if some of them did not actively rebel, the rest would probably ignore it. The only paper of zoological interest which uses Scheme 1 is Bates' classic of 1862, which is now read for historical interest only.

6. I therefore submit that the most sensible course is to follow Scheme 2, and to conserve the name *H. erato* sensu Aurivillius, 1882 by designating a specimen of Species A as neotype of *P. erato* L., 1758. The following specimen is proposed as neotype of *H. erato* sensu Aurivillius housed in the British Museum (Natural History): 'Berg. en Dal. Surinam. 1898-9. Michls./*erato erato* Linn./866./20.20. ex coll. Riffarth/Joicey Bequest, Brit. Mus. 1934-120.' This is very probably the specimen photographed in Stichel & Riffarth (1905, *Das Tierreich*, Lief. 22 Heliconiidae, p. 199).

7. The International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature is therefore requested:

- (1) to use its plenary powers to set aside all designations of type specimen hitherto made for *Papilio erato* Linn., 1758, and having done so to designate the specimen now held in the British Museum (Natural History) and as detailed in paragraph 6 above, as neotype of that species;
- (2) to place the following specific names
  - (a) *erato* Linnaeus, 1758 as published in the binomen *Papilio erato* and as defined by reference to the neotype designated in (1) above, and
  - (b) *doris* Linnaeus, 1771, as published in the binomen *Papilio doris* Linnaeus, 1771 on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology.